

Judicial Administration Committee
Judicial Conference of Indiana

Minutes
April 14, 2000

The Judicial Administration Committee of the Judicial Conference of Indiana met at the Indiana Judicial Center on Friday, April 14, 2000 from 10:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

1. Members present. Scott R. Bowers, Roland W. Chamblee, Tom D. Diller, John L. Kellam, Richard T. Payne, Stephen E. Platt, and Frances C. Gull, Chair.
2. Staff present. Jeffrey Bercovitz provided the committee with staff assistance.
3. Minutes approved. The minutes of the committee on March 10, 2000 were approved.
4. Update Study - Judicial Weighted Caseload Measures.
 - a. The members of the committee prepared a mission statement and list of concerns for the update study of judicial weighted caseload measures. See Attachment No. 1.
 - b. The committee members revised a time line of activities for their update study of judicial weighted caseload measures. See Attachment No. 2.
 - c. The committee members discussed the use of a team to review the frequency of actions in case files in various counties for consistency.
 - d. The members of the committee discussed the broad parameters of a grant to hire a consultant to administer the update study. They agreed to ask Jim Jezek to review the outline of meetings.
5. Next meeting. The committee members agreed to meet again on Friday, April 14, 2000, 10:00 a.m.- 4:00 p.m.; Friday, June 9, 2000, 10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.; Friday, July 14, 2000, 10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.; Friday, August 11, 2000; meet in conjunction with the September conference; Friday, October 13, 2000, 10:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.; cancel the November 10, 2000 meeting; meet in conjunction with the December conference on December 7, 2000; Friday, January 12, February 9, March 9, April 13, May 11, June 8, July 13 and August 13, 2001 from 10:00 a.m. until 4:00 p.m. at the Judicial Center.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey Bercovitz, Director
Probation and Juvenile Services

Review of Judicial Weighted Caseload Measures Mission Statement

The Judicial Administration Committee has accepted the challenge to update the 1996 judicial weighted caseload study.

Judges across the state have expressed concerns about accuracy of the original data, the use of the study to distribute cases and resources, and areas unaddressed by the original study. The 1996 study recommendations included collection of further data. In furtherance of that recommendation the committee will recommend procedures to review and refine the study to assure the overall improvement of the quality, consistency and usefulness of the weighted caseload system.

The Committee will analyze the original methodology used to establish weighted caseloads; collect additional data; expand the categories of cases requiring study; and provide information required for assessing future need and allocation of judicial resources.

Concerns: Need to revisit these in final report.

State Court Administrator's Office needs to hire staff to enforce consistent data collection and reporting.

Need to refine consistent data collection.

The impact of district plans including, but not limited to, where cases transferred are counted, transfers of cases in and out of the court and the county, use of special judges, adjustment of caseloads based on the impact of a district plan, the impact of the geography/travel time.

Intercounty transfer of cases, including the transfer of divorce cases from circuit to superior courts, the transfer of a criminal case after reduction from a C felony to D felony.

Consistent filing of juvenile cases: Assigning a CHINS number to "scare" a child into going into an alternative school program.

Length of post disposition times in dissolution cases. This may be an education issue for judges.

Issues have been created for special jurisdiction judges. Example: comparison of the number of cases without looking at total workload of the courts.

Capital, Murder, and A felonies need to be separate treated.

Separation of civil plenary cases that include a wide of variety of cases that take varying amount of time. Are too many types if cases averaged together? Ex: collection cases vs. mortgage foreclosure. If the sampling of cases are broad enough, the civil plenary docket will average out. This may be an education issue.

Special issues that may impact Lake and Marion county, including but not limited to the following: plea agreement policy, no murder pleas, death penalty cases, habitual offenders, D felony caseload, concentration of very serious felonies.

Local concerns must be considered: the amount of staff, the look at how this data is generated

Administrative concerns and time spent for juvenile courts in counties with detention centers and the time judges spend on administrative matters generally.

A judicial impact statement should be prepared for every piece of legislation or rule change.

Timeline for Judicial Weighted Caseload Measures Update Project - 2000

Project Activities: Analysis, Preparation, Data Collection & Writing, Draft Report, Presentation & Comments, Final Report

February 11, 2000	Presentation of background on prior project; Decision to conduct judicial weighted caseload measures project; develop list of case types/areas to be studied/updated
March 10, 2000	Prioritize case types/areas to be studied/updated; Decide those that can be handled by "Delphi" method and those which need empirical, quantitative study
April 14, 2000	No Ron and Lilia Begin application for grant funding of project; review recommendations from first project and how they were implemented.
May 12, 2000	No meeting Complete application for grant funding of project; Discuss contract with consultant. How does Indiana (Lilia) and Colorado (Jezek) handle transfer cases?
June 9, 2000	No Jeff and Lilia. Jezek on speaker phone. Determination of hours each year available for a judge or other judicial officer, review past data; Retain consultant; Review of time sheet categories for judicial case and noncase related activities
July 14, 2000	Jezek in person. Pilot study of revised time sheet; determine when time study will be conducted; Prepare list of small, medium and large counties and judicial officers to participate in time study; Prepare materials and speakers for training session for judicial officers to conduct time study; prepare training session for either court personnel to conduct file review during time study.
August 11, 2000	<u>Meeting scheduled!</u> July meeting tasks continued.
September 20, 2000	French Lick July meeting tasks continued
October 13, 2000	Jezek in person. Time study begins; Case audit portion of study by one team.
November 10, 2000	Veteran's Day No meeting; Staff & Consultant compile data from study;
December 7, 2000	Conf. Indy Staff & Consultant determine if more data is needed; Committee review of data from time and case audit portions of study; begin preparation of report
January 12, 2001	Jezek in person. December meeting tasks continued

February 9, 2001	Prepare draft report of time study findings at work-study session; review data tables
March 9, 2001	Jezek in person. Finalize hours each year available for a judge or other judicial officer; Finalize average time for judges to process various case types
April 13, 2001	Prepare draft report; prepare draft report for distribution
May 11, 2001	Jezek in person. Continue preparation of draft report
June 8, 2001	Prepare final report based on comments on draft; distribute final draft report to courts, key legislators, and others
July 13, 2001	Continue preparation of final report
August 10, 2001	Finish final report; Close grant.